

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03739 040158Z

11
ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 ACDA-19

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 EBB-11 OC-06 CCO-00 DRC-01 OMB-01 /109 W
----- 006335

R 032355Z JUL 74
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 6616
SECDEF WASHDC
INFO USCINCEUR
USNMR SHAPE
USLOSACLANT
CINCLANT
CICUSNAVEUR

SECRET USNATO 3739

E.O. 11652: GDS 12-31-82
TAGS: MCAP, NATO
SUBJECT: NATO RATIONALIZATION POTENTIAL STUDY

REF: USNATO 3630

SUMMARY: MISSION HAS RECEIVED 45 COPIES OF NATO VERSION OF THE US MATRIX AND HAS REVIEWED THIS VERSION ALONG SAME LINES REPORTED REFTEL. MISSION PROPOSES CHANGES WHICH SHOULD, IN OUR VIEW BE MADE BEFORE PRESENTING MATRIX TO ALLIES. ACTION REQUESTED: WASHINGTON COMMENTS. END SUMMARY.

1. MISSION HAD IDENTIFIED SEVERAL AREAS IN NATO VERSION OF MATRIX WHICH SHOULD, IN OUR VIEW, BE MODIFIED BEFORE PRESENTING THE MATRIX TO THE EWG. DISCUSSION OF THESE AREAS FOLLOWS:

A. DOCUMENT SHOULD AGAIN BE SCREENED FOR ITS RELEASABILITY TO NATO IN TERMS OF POSSIBLE ALLIED SENSITIVITIES. PAGE A-4-1, FIRST TWO DISADVANTAGES SHOULD BE
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03739 040158Z

ELEIMATED. PAGE B-1-3, SECOND AND FOURTH DISADVANTAGES AND FOOTNOTE 2 CONTAINS US CONSIDERATIONS THAT SHOULD BE LEFT OUT OF THIS NATO VERSION.

B. CONCERNING COOPERATIVE PROCUREMENT OF TACTICAL

AIRCRAFT, WE SEE TWO PROBLEMS IN ADDITION TO THOSE MENTIONED IN SUBPARAS 2B AND 2F OF REFTEL:

(1) ON PAGES C-1" -2 AND C-1-3, THE STUDY PROPOSES THAT THE BELGIANS AND DUTCH DROP EITHER THE AIR DEFENSE OR GROUND SUPPORT ROLE WHICH SOULD, INSTEAD, BE PICKED UP BY SOME OF THE OVER 1000 FRG/UK/US F-4'S CAPABLE OF EITHER AIR DEFENSE OR GRAOUND ATTACK. WE SEE A PROBLEM IN THIS PROPOSAL IN THAT MANY OF THE FRG/UK/US AIR DEFENSE F-4'S ARE NOT BASED IN THE CORRECT LOCATION TO ASSUME THE LOST AWX INTERCEPTOR FUNCTIONS.

(2) PAGE C-1-3 ALSO DISCUSSES THE POSSIBILITY OF THE BELGIANS AND DUTCH BUYING A-7'S, A-10'S, JAGUARS, OR MIRAGES FOR THE GROUND ATTACK ROLE. IN VIEW OF THE EXTENSIVE US EFFORTS TO SELL EITHER THE YF-16 OR YF-17 TO NATO NATIONS, WE RECOMMEND THAT THE TYPE OF AIRCRAFT NOT BE SPECIFIED AND THAT THE REFERENCE BY TO ONLY GROUND SUPPORT AIRCRAFT INGENERAL. THE FIGURES USED COULD, HOWEVER, REMAIN IN THE COSTING ANALYSIS FOR PURPOSES OF ILLUSTRATION.

C. IN SECTION E-3, THE 16 MILLION DOLLAR INVESTMENT COST FOR AWACS (SHOWN IN TABLE II) APPEARS INCORRECT OR NOT ADEQUATELY EXPLAINED. TEN AWAC'S WOULD COST BETWEEN 300 AND 500 MILLION DOLLARS, DEPENDING ON CONFIGURATION. FURTHER, OUR ESTIMATE OF THE FIVE YEAR OPERATING COST OF 10 AWAC'S ALONE WOULD BE ABOUT 50 MILLION DOLLARS, WHILE TABLE II SHOWS A TOTAL OF 53 MILLION DOLLARS FOR ALL THE TAC AIR CONTROL FUNCTIONS COMBINED.

D. IN THE LOGISTICS SECTION OF APPENDIX A, THE STUDY DISCUSSES STANDARDIZATION OF AIR-DELIVERED MUNITIONS WITH THE US DEVELOPING AND PRODUCING ALL SUCH NUMITIONS FOR THE ALLIANCE. NO ALL ALLIES WILL AGREE THAT THE US IS DEVELOPING AND PRODUCING THE RIGHT KIND OF MUNITIONS TO SATISFY NATO REQUIREMENTS. IN ADDITION THIS PARAGRAPH HAS TOO MUCH OF A "BUY US" FLAVOR. WE FEEL DEGREE OF SPECIALIZATION WITHIN THE BROAD AREA OF AIR-DELIVERED MUNITIONS WOULD BE APPROPRIATE BUT NOT ACROSS THE BOARD.

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03739 040158Z

E. CONCERNING REPLACEMENT PROGRAMS FOR FRG, TURKISH AND GREEK DESTROYERS, OUT PREVIOUS COMMENTS (PARA 2D REFTEL) STILL APPLY. MISSION FEELS WE SHOULD PLACE THE EMPHASIS ON BETTER EMPLOYMENT OF DESTROYER ASSETS AND NOT PROPOSE CANCELLATION OF REPLACEMENT PROGRAMS WERE TOO FEW ASSETS EXIST NOW AND FOR THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE.

F. WITH REGARD TO HOST NATION SUPPORT:

(1) PAGE 2 OF THE STUDY (LAST PARA) REFERS TO THE PLANNING BOARD FOR EUROPEAN INLAND SURFACE TRANSPORTATION (PBEIST) AS A MANAGEMENT AGENCY. REFERENC TO PBEIST SHOULD BE DROPPED AS THIS BOARD IS NOT A MANAGEMENT AGENCY AS SUCH AND DOES NOT LEND ITSELF TO CONSOLIDATION.

(2) PAGE A-2-2 OF THE STUDY REFERS TO A J-4

EUCOM STUDY CONCLUSION THAT THE INITIAL US LOC NEED COULD BE MET WITH A MANAGEMENT AGENCY OF 500 MEN AND HOST NATION CIVILIAN SUPPORT ASSETS. TECHNICALLY, THIS SHOULD READ "LOGISTIC LIAISON AGENCY" NOT "MANAGEMENT AGENCY". FURTHER, THE EUROPEAMS ARE SENSITIVE TO ANY SUGGESTION THAT THE US WILL "MANAGE" CIVIL LOGISTIC FACILITIES.

(3) PAGE A-2-5 OF THE STUDY LISTS AS A DIS-ADVANTAGE THE PROPOSITION THAT HOST NATION PERSONNEL COULD INHIBIT WITHDRAWAL OF STOCKS FOR UNILATERAL CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS. THIS ISSUE SEEMS TO BE RAISED FOR US EYES ONLY AND THEREFORE SHOULD BE DELETED OR FULLY EXPLAINED AS A NATO PROBLEM.

G. THE INCONSISTENCIES IN PROCUREMENT AND OPERATING COSTS NOTED IN PARAGRAPH 2J OF REFTEL, WHILE PERHAPS NOT SIGNIFICANT NUMERICALLY, SHOULD BE ELIMINATED OR FULLY EXPLAINED. SUCH VARIANCES DETRACT FROM THE CREDIBILITY OF THE STUDY AND REQUIRE UNNECESSARY TIME FOR RESOLUTION. EXAMPLES OF THESE INCONSISTENCIES ARE:

(1) PAGE D-1-3. THE ANNUAL OPERATING COST FOR DEG/PF, DEG, AND DE/DEP ARE SHOWN TO BE \$3.5M, \$.6M AND \$0.6/\$0.4M RESPECTIVELY. THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN \$3.5M AND \$0.6/\$0.4 SEEMS EXCESSIVE, IN ADDITION, THE ANNUAL OPERATING COST FOR A PTGF WORKS OUT TO BE \$0.05M AND \$0.03M FOR GREECE AND TURKEY RESPECTIVELY.

(2) PAGE E-4-3. THE ANNUAL OPERATING COST FOR A NORWEGIAN PHM WORKS OUT TO BE \$0.8M. ON PAGE D-1-3 THE ANNUAL OPERATING COST FOR A FRG PHM WORKS OUT TO BE \$1.3M.

(3) PAGE E-4-4. THE ANNUAL OPERATING COST FOR SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 03739 040158Z

A DUTCH DEG WORKS OUT TO BE \$2.8M. ON PAGE D-1-3 THE ANNUAL OPERATING COST FOR A GREEK DEG WORKS OUT TO BE \$0.6M.

(4) PAGE E-4-8. IN THE CHART AT THE TOP OF THE PAGE, THE COSTS OF \$72M AND \$384M RESPECTIVELY FOR 6 AND 24 ASW PARTOL AIRCRAFT ARE INCONSISTENT. THE CHART ALSO INDICATES AN ANNUAL OPERATING COST OF \$150M FOR OPERATING NO AEW AIRCRAFT.

H. THE LAST SECTENCE AT THE TOP OF PAGE 4 MENTIONS "US LIST OF PRIORITY AREAS PROPOSED TO NATO OVER THE PAST YEAR." THIS SHOULD BE CHANGED TO READ "LIST OF PRIORITY AREAS UNDER STUDY IN NATO."

2. THE COMMENTS PROVIDED BY SUBPARAS 2G, 2H, AND 2I OF REFTEL STILL APPLY TO THE NATO VERSION OF THE STUDY. ALTHOUGH IT MAY NOT NE NECESSARY NOW TO CHANGE THE STUDY WITH REGARD TO THESE ITEMS, WE SHOULD BE PREPARED TO BACK UP OR MODIFY PREMISES AND FIGURES AT A LATER DATE.

3. IN VIEW OF THE MAGNITUDE OF THE MODIFICATIONS PROPOSED IN PARA 1 ABOVE, WE RECOMMEND THAT WASHINGTON PROVIDE NEW PAGES REFLECTING THOSE CHANGES CONSIDERED APPROPRIATE. MISSION THEN WOULD INCORPORATE THE NEW PAGES INTO OUR

COPIES AND DISTRIBUTE THE STUDY TO NATO WHEN AUTHORIZATION RECEIVED. ACTION REQUESTED: WASHINGTON COMMENTS.
RUMSFELD

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptoning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 03 JUL 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: garlanwa
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO03739
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS 12-31-82
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740788/abbrvzj.tel
Line Count: 167
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: USNATO 3630
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: garlanwa
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 09 APR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <09 APR 2002 by boyleja>; APPROVED <13-Sep-2002 by garlanwa>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: NATO RATIONALIZATION POTENTIAL STUDY
TAGS: MCAP, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO USCINCEUR
USNMR SHAPE
USLOSACLANT
CINCLANT
CICUSNAVEUR
Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005